

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of all the pending claims are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-17, as shown above, are pending herein. Claims 18 and 19 have been added, support clearly being found at least on page 6, lines 2-5 of the instant specification.

Claims 1, 4, 6-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 (e) over European Application EP 1 143 679 to Maes (hereinafter "Maes"). Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that Maes fails to disclose or suggest that a voice data packet is created from an input of audio data by a user, as is recited by instant claim 1. Page 12, lines, 5-7 of the instant specification at least provides support for this recitation. Independent claims 7 and 15 have been amended with similar language.

Maes, at best, discloses that a multi-modal access is provided to enable access to, for example, the World Wide Web without the requiring the client to use a GUI-capable device. Maes, however, is completely silent with regarding to creating a voice data packet from a user's sending of audio data.

In addition, Maes is completely silent with regard to the purchasing capability being offline, and in fact, said reference is concerned with online functions such as video on demand.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that none of base claims 1, 7 and 15 are anticipated by Maes. All of the claims dependent on one of claims 1, 7 and 15 are believed to be allowable both because of their dependency on an allowable claim, and because of an independent basis for patentability.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-3, 5, 8, 12 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Maes and Katz (U.S. 6,055,513, hereafter "Katz'513"). Applicants respectfully traverse this ground of rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Maes and Katz'513 fails even to disclose or suggest all the elements of Applicant's base claims, let alone render the rejected claims obvious over the combination of said references.

The combination of Maes and Katz, for example, is completely silent with regard to the creation of a voice data packet in response to audio data input by the user. The combination of references is also completely silent with regard to claimed capability of purchasing via an offline process, as recited by instant claims 18 and 19 and supported in the specification at least at page 6, lines 2-5.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the instant claims would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art over the combination of Maes and Katz'513. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this ground of rejection are respectfully requested.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action have been overcome, and all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner deem that there are any issues which may be best resolved by telephone, please contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below. If there are any fees due and owing, please charge Applicants' Deposit Account on file.

Respectfully submitted,

John Vodopia  
Registration No. 36,299

Date: August 11, 2004

By:   
Steve Cha  
Registration No. 44,069

Mail all correspondence to:

John Vodopia, Registration #36,299  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
345 Scarsborough Road  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510  
Phone: (914) 333-9652  
Fax: (914) 332-0615